

REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **14 June 2006**, the Examiner reviewed claims 1-30. Claims 1-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claims 1-9, 11-19 and 21-29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Orrin (US Pub. No. 2002/0128940 hereinafter "Orrin"). Claims 10, 20 and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Orrin, in view of Stone (US Pub. No. 2002/0128958 hereinafter "Stone").

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112

The Examiner points out that claims 1-30 are rejected for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter, and also points out that the conditional statements in the claims do not specify what happens if the limitations do not occur. Applicant respectfully submits that currently amended claims 1, 4, 11, 14, 21, and 24 clarify what happens if the limitations in the claims do not occur, and the amendments in independent claims 1, 11, and 21 further serve to clarify what happens if the limitations do not occur in dependent claims 3, 5, 13, 15, 23, and 25.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) and 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Independent claims 1, 11, and 21 were rejected over Orrin in view of Stone.

Applicant respectfully submits that the present invention discloses **validating permissions** to perform the various financial transactional operations, and also discloses that these permissions are stored in a central permission database (see page 11, lines 22-27 of the instant application). This is beneficial because **requiring permissions for various relevant operations in addition to signature validation for the various actors** ensures stronger security during the

various intermediate steps involved in processing the financial transactions. In addition, using a central permission table provides an up to date unified view of all user authorizations within the system (see page 12, lines 6-19 of the instant application).

Applicant respectfully submits that there is nothing, either implicit or explicit, either separately or in the combined system of Orrin and Stone that suggests the use of validated permissions for the transactional operations performed by the various actors, that is separate from the use of validated credentials for the various actors themselves, or suggests the use of a central permission database that provides a unified view.

Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 11, and 21 to clarify that the present invention discloses the use of permissions for operations and that these permissions are stored in a central permission table. These amendments find support in page 11, lines 22-27, and page 12, lines 6-19 of the instant application. Dependent claims 2, 12, and 22 have been canceled without due prejudice.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 11, and 21 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 3-10, which depend upon claim 1, claims 13-20, which depend upon claim 11, and claims 23-30, which depend upon claim 21, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By



Shun Yao

Registration No. 59,242

Date:

Shun Yao
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95618-7759
Tel: (530) 759-1667
Fax: (530) 759-1665
Email: shun@parklegal.com